DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 231 CG 026 963

AUTHOR Steward, Robbie J.; Wright, Doris J.
TITLE Multicultural Counseling Training and Ratings of "Culturally Sensitive" and "Culturally Insensitive" White Counselors by White Counselor-trainees.
PUB DATE Mar 96
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Counseling; *Counselor Attitudes; Counselor Characteristics; *Counselor Training; *Cultural Awareness; Multicultural Education; Opinions; *Sensitivity Training; *Whites
IDENTIFIERS Counselor Effectiveness; *Cultural Sensitivity

ABSTRACT

Research in multicultural literature addressing the dynamics among Whites have primarily addressed counselor-client dyads. This study examines how training in multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills influences the evaluation of White counselors' multicultural counseling competence. Fifty-four White Americans enrolled in American Psychological Association-approved counseling psychology graduate programs viewed videotapes of one "culturally sensitive" and one "culturally insensitive" counselor. Both counselors were working with an African American male client discussing problems of racial discrimination in the work environment. Findings suggest that while multicultural training significantly influenced the evaluation process of the "culturally sensitive" counselor, no significant contribution was made to the variance in ratings of the "culturally insensitive" one. Some trends which emerged from the results include the following: (1) The difference between ratings of a "culturally sensitive" and "culturally insensitive" counselor is greater when White raters report more extensive multicultural counseling training; (2) White raters with more multicultural training tended to evaluate a White "culturally sensitive" counselor more positively than those with less training; and (3) If the White rater is responsible for evaluating more than one counselor in a group featuring a wide range of multicultural competencies, "culturally sensitive" White counselors might be penalized in the evaluation process. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 395 231

RUNNING HEAD: MULTICULTURAL COUNSELING SUPERVISION

Multicultural Counseling Training and Ratings of 'Culturally Sensitive' and 'Culturally Insensitive' White Counselors by White Counselor-trainees

Robbie J. Steward

436 Erickson Hall

Michigan State University

East Lansing, MI 48824

517-355-8502 (O)

517-347-0464 (H)

517-353-6393 (FAX)

DEVINE@msu.edu (e-mail)

Doris J. Wright

Georgia State University

submitted to the Journal of Counseling Psychology

for review for publication

March 5, 1996

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG026963

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. STEWARD

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Abstract

Examined the effects of multicultural counseling training (awareness, knowledge, skills) on the perceptions of counselor competence. White Americans enrolled in APA-approved counseling psychology graduate programs located in the Southern and Mid-western regions viewed videotapes of one 'culturally sensitive' and one 'culturally insensitive' counselor. Both counselors were working with an African American male client whose presenting problem was related to racial discrimination in the work environment. Although multicultural counseling training contributed significantly to the variance in ratings of the 'culturally sensitive' counselor, no significant contribution was made to the variance in ratings of the 'culturally insensitive' counselor.. Possible explanations and implications of these results in multicultural supervision are discussed.

Introduction

Studies in the multicultural literature addressing the dynamics between Whites have primarily addressed counselor-client dyads (Carter, 1995). Without multicultural training, communication within White counselor/client dyads has been found to proceed with unspoken assumptions about similarity in attitudes about race and race relations in this country (Ochs, 1994; Tyler, Brome, & Williams, 1991). In addition, White counselors' levels of racial identity have been linked to well-defined differences in counseling process with White clients in addressing issues of race (Carter, 1995). Because a significant and moderate relationship has been found between White racial identity and multicultural counseling competency (Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994), it might be assumed that multicultural counseling competency or training influences how White counselors will work with White clients. Such would suggest that multicultural counseling training can create a within group difference within dyads of White practitioners that will result in a very different outcome.

Counseling process in some ways is very similar to that involved in counseling supervision. Supervisors, like counselors, help others in the examination of behavior, thoughts, and feelings, particularly when these act as barriers to effective performance in either client or supervisee process (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992). Consequently, it might be assumed that multicultural counseling training will similarly influence the supervision process between the White supervisor and supervisee (Cook, 1994). The process and outcome of supervision, in general, might be very different for the White supervisee whose White supervisor has received multicultural training. The study of this dyad would be particularly important given that most supervision dyads within the profession consist of White professionals and trainees.

However, there is a single most important difference between counseling and supervision: evaluation. Supervisors have both the power and responsibility to evaluate, influence, and judge trainees' counseling skills (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Blocher, 1983; Cook; 1994; Hunt, 1987; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Peterson, 1991). In service delivery to racial/ethnic minority clients, White supervisors must be able to discern between the multiculturally sensitive and multiculturally insensitive White counselor. The multiculturally competent supervisor must be able to provide to the less skilled, inexperienced, and less knowledgeable trainee with skills, knowledge, and personal awareness, to assist clients in a professional and ethical manner (Carter, 1995). However, given the evaluation component, supervisors have an initial challenge of accurately identifying supervisees' multicultural counseling skill deficits and strengths. Competence in doing so should be particularly important given that supervision is not the appropriate time for counselors or supervisors' awareness of multicultural dynamics to begin (Bernard, 1994). Though the literature suggests that much more needs to be done to prepare supervisors for their roles (Carter, 1995; Leong & Wagner, 1994), how training will influence the process of White on White evaluation is not understood. The influence of multicultural counseling training on White/White counseling competence evaluation has not been examined at this time.

Over the past decades, evaluation of multicultural counseling competence has moved from a reliance on traditional counselor effectiveness instruments (Carkhuff, 1969; Barret-Lennard, 1962) to measures focusing on social influence and credibility of the counselors (Atkinson & Wampold, 1982; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983; Gazda, Asbury, Balzea, Childers, & Walter, 1977) to the most strongly recommended measure, the Cross-Cultural Competency Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R) (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991). The

CCCI-R is based on a Division 17 report that was specifically developed to meet the needs for explicit assessment of counseling effectiveness with culturally diverse clients for the purpose of training and supervision. Though studies using the CCCI-R have primarily focused on targeted racial/ethnic minority group members' perception of White counselors' cross-cultural competence (Atkinson, Casas, & Abreu, 1992; Gim, Atkinson, & Kim, 1991), currently, information regarding the perceptions of individuals who have received counseling training is limited, particularly within White on White evaluation.

The purpose of this study is to examine how training in multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills influence the evaluation of White counselors' multicultural counseling competence. Though it would have been ideal to study actual White supervision dyads, because of the required extensive time and cost that would be involved in such an endeavor, advanced graduate level trainees, instead, were chosen as participants, and exposed to the same cross-cultural counseling sessions for the purpose of evaluation. The design requiring trainees to be exposed to videotaped sessions of a cross-culturally insensitive and a cross-culturally sensitive counselor was based upon a recommendation of the developers of the CCCI-R measure (LaFromboise et al., 1991).

The CCCI-R was chosen for inclusion in this study because: it was designed for use by supervisors in evaluating counselors'' multicultural counseling competencies; and, of its use in previous studies addressing multicultural counseling competence using videotaped session. The Multicultural Awareness Knowledge and Skills Survey (MAKSS) (D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991) was selected as the self-report measure of multicultural training because of item-focus on

instructional objectives with adequate reliability and evidence of criterion-related validity with the population sampled in this study.

The following research questions will be examined: Do multicultural counseling awareness, knowledge and skill training significantly influence trainees' ability to discern between a culturally sensitive and a culturally insensitive counselor? Do multicultural counseling awareness, knowledge and skill training influence the evaluation of a culturally sensitive counselor differently than a culturally insensitive counselor? The researchers hypothesize that multicultural counseling training will significantly influence the evaluation of White counselors' multicultural counseling competence by White trainees.

Method

Participants

Participants were 54 White graduate-level counselor-trainees (41 masters-level and 13 doctoral level; 10 men and 44 women) enrolled in two APA-approved counseling psychology programs at 2 large (20,000+) predominantly White state universities in the Mid-west and Southern regions in the USA. Masters' level participants were solicited from counseling practica so that all trainees involved in the study would have acquired general knowledge of counseling theory and practice. All students present at both institutions agreed to participate in the study. Participants ranged in age from 22 to 50 years old (M=31.46). (Non-White students attending classes completed packets, but these were not included in the study.) Ethnic group representation included Russian- (2), Jewish- (n=8), Italian- (n=3), Irish- (n=4), German- (n=5), and English-Americans (n=10). Twenty-two respondents indicated 'American' as ethnic group.

Reported annual income ranged from $10,000 to $100,000 (M=$43,392). All geographical regions were represented as points of origin among participants.

Participants were randomly assigned to 2 groups in order to examine the possibility of an order-effect. Group 1 (n=27) was shown the culturally sensitive counseling session first and the culturally insensitive counseling session second. Sessions were presented in reverse for members of Group 2 (n=27). Group comparisons of mean total MAKSS scores indicated no significant differences (Mean Group 1=160.33; Mean Group 2=155.32; t=1.10, p=.27). It was hypothesized that the order in which sessions were presented would have no significant effect on evaluation.

Independent Variables

Multicultural Awareness Knowledge Skills Survey (MAKSS) (D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991). This 60-item measure consists of two parts: a demographic section addressing sex, age, race and ethnicity, cultural backgrounds, current educational level, current occupation, and annual family income; and a section of 60-items designed to assess individuals' self-reported competence in multicultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural skill. Each survey item is presented as a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (4) to strongly agree (1). Total scale scores were obtained by summing the 20 specific items related specifically to each of the 3 subscales (awareness, knowledge, and skill). An example of the Awareness subscale item is: "At this point in your life, how would you rate your understanding of the impact of the way you think and act when interacting with persons of different cultural backgrounds?" (very limited to very aware). An example of the Knowledge subscale item is: "At the present time, how would you rate your own understanding of the following terms: ethnicity (very limited to very good); cultural encapsulation (very limited to very good)." An example of the Skill

subscale item is "How would you rate your ability to conduct an effective counseling interview with a person from a cultural background significantly different from your own?" (very limited to very good).

Higher scale scores indicate a high degree of multicultural awareness, knowledge and multicultural skills. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) for the instrument are .75, .90, and .96 for the multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills subscales respectively. All three subscale reliabilities were judged acceptable for purposes of analyzing the treatment effects. Pretest and posttest interscale correlations suggest that related but not identical dimensions are being measured. Evidence for construct validity is presented by the authors predominantly in the form of factor analysis and an analysis strategy whereby each factor was considered individually against alternative to a one-factor solution. Item-scale correlations and the internal consistency reliability also provide additional evidence related to construct validity. Content validity resides in the derivation of the items from specified instructional objectives (D'Andrea et al., 1991, Sue et al., 1982).

Dependent Variable

Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory--Revised (CCCI-R). The Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory was developed by Hernandez and LaFromboise (1985) and later revised by LaFromboise, Coleman, and Hernandez (1991). The CCCI-R assesses respondents' perceptions of a counselor's cultural competence and is based on the counseling competencies identified in the 1980 report of the Education and training Committee of Division 17 of the American Psychological Association (D.W. Sue et al., 1982). The CCCI-R contains 20 items focusing on counselor interview behavior. Examples of items are "Counselors values and respects cultural

differences" and "Counselor demonstrates knowledge about a client's culture." Respondents rate items on a 6-point bipolar scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). LaFromboise et al. (1991) reported coefficient alpha values for the CCCI-R of .78 and .95 in two separate studies. They also found support for the content validity of the instrument by documenting 80% rater agreement between items of the CCCI-R and the counseling competencies identified by D.W. Sue et al., on which the items were based. Additional support for the content validity of the CCCI-R has been provided by Pomales et al. (1986) and Gim et al. (1991), both of which found that counselors in a culturally responsive role were rated significantly higher on the CCCI-R than counselors in a culturally unresponsive role.

Videotaped sessions. The two 15-20 minute videotaped sessions included in this study were chosen from a pool of 14 female counselor trainees' videotaped sessions with an African American male client with the same presenting concern related to his emotional and behavioral response to racial discrimination and harassment in the work environment. This was a 'real' problem that the client had struggled with some time in the past.

Session selection was based on agreement of the client's (African American male), a doctoral level trainee with multicultural counseling training (White American male), a doctoral level trainee without multicultural training (White American female), and a faculty members' (African American female) independent rating of the counselor's expressed empathy (1-9). A rating of a nine indicated the highest level of expressed empathy; one, indicated the lowest level of expressed empathy. All four raters indicated a rating of a 2 on the session chosen for inclusion of this study as the 'culturally insensitive' counselor; all four raters indicated a rating of an 8 on the session chosen for inclusion of this study as the 'culturally sensitive counselor. These were the

highest and lowest ratings represented among all ratings. The 'culturally insensitive' counselor tended to ignore the client's attempt to address issues of race and did not attend to the client's presenting affective response to his current situation. The 'culturally sensitive' counselor directly addressed the issues of race outside and inside the counseling session and attended to the client's affective response.

In order to check 'client's' presentation consistency across sessions, participants completed a client rating scale that assesses counselor's perception of the client on an adjective checklist with positive and negative descriptors. Participants rated their perception of the client in both the culturally sensitive and insensitive sessions. No significant differences were found between the two repeated measures.

Procedure

Participants received written and oral directions for packet completion. Sessions were to be viewed in order to evaluate counselor's cross-cultural counseling competence. Researchers requested that trainees listen carefully to both counselors' responses and client's responses to the counselor in the process of evaluation. Participants completed a MAKSS, viewed session #1, completed a CCCI-R #1, viewed session #2, and completed CCCI-R #2 in one sitting. After viewings, participants returned to the classroom the following week for debriefing about the purpose of the study and to discuss the counseling sessions.

Data Analysis

For purposes of analysis, total scores were computed for each participant on the CCCI-R. Three multiple regression analyses were performed. The first examined the contribution of MAKSS subscale scores (e.g., Awareness, Knowledge, Skills) (independent variables) to the

difference between CCCI-R #1 and CCCI-R#2 (dependent variable). The second examined the contribution of MAKSS subscale scores (independent variables) to the CCCI-R of the culturally sensitive counselor (dependent variable). The third examined the contribution of MAKSS subscale scores (independent variables) to the CCCI-R of the culturally insensitive counselor (dependent variable).

Results

In an analysis comparing mean group CCCI-R differences, a significant order effect was found (Mean of Group 1=34.34; Mean of Group 2=9.85; t=3.01; p=.004). Additional analyses revealed significant differences between CCCI-R scores in Group 1 in which the most skilled counselor was viewed first (Mean of Group 1=88.22; Mean of Group 2=55.37; t=6.06; p=.000) However, no significant differences were found between CCCI-T scores in Group 2 in which the least skilled counselor was viewed first (Mean of Group 1=60.28; Mean of Group 2=50.42; t=1.82; p=.08).

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum scores for each of the variables and a correlation matrix of relationships between all variables.

Table 2 presents the results of the first multiple regression analysis that examined the contribution of the MAKSS subscale scores to the difference between CCCI-R #1(culturally sensitive counselor) and CCCI-R #2 (culturally insensitive counselor). MAKSS subscale scores were found to significantly contribute to 24.8% of the variance in differences between the ratings of the culturally sensitive and insensitive counselors (r square= .248; p=.002). Of all the MAKSS subscales, Awareness subscale scores were the primary contributor to this variance (p=.004). Results indicate that multicultural counseling training, particularly in Awareness, significantly,

contributes to trainees' discrimination between a most and least competent cross-cultural counseling skills.

Table 3 presents the results of the second multiple regression analysis that examined the contribution of the MAKSS subscale scores to CCCI-R ratings of the culturally sensitive counselor. MAKSS subscale scores were found to significantly contribute to 23.7% of the variance in the ratings of the culturally sensitive counselor (r square= .237; p=.01). Of all the MAKSS subscales, Awareness subscale scores were the primary contributor to this variance (p=.049). Results indicate that multicultural counseling training, particularly Awareness, significantly contributes to raters' evaluation of the 'culturally sensitive' counseling session.

Table 4 presents the results of the third multiple regression analysis that examined the contribution of the MAKSS subscale scores to CCCI-R ratings of the culturally insensitive counselor. MAKSS subscale scores were not found to significantly contribute to the rating of the culturally insensitive counselor.

Discussion

Findings suggest that multicultural counseling training significantly influences the evaluation process of multicultural counseling competence among White counselors. There are several trends that should be noted in these results. First, the difference between ratings of a 'culturally sensitive' and 'culturally insensitive' counselor is greater when White raters report more extensive multicultural counseling training. Second, White raters with more multicultural training tended to evaluate a White 'culturally sensitive' counselor more positively than those with less training. It might be concluded that in cases with minority clients who are specifically

addressing issues of race with White counselors, perceived effectiveness by White raters is directly associated with raters' prior multicultural training experiences.

Third, the importance of examining the relationship between the evaluation of multicultural competence and raters' level of multicultural counseling training is further highlighted by the order effect that was found in this study. It appears that if the White rater is responsible for evaluating more than one counselor in a group with a wide range of multicultural competencies, 'culturally sensitive', White counselors might be penalized in the evaluation process. This conclusion is supported by data indicating that the mean ratings for the 'culturally insensitive' counselor did not differ significantly across conditions of order presentation (CCCI-R #1=55; CCCI-R #2=50), while the ratings for the 'culturally sensitive' counselor did (CCCI-R #1=88; CCCI-R #2=60). It is particularly important to note given that the 'culturally sensitive' counselor's mean rating in the second condition was similar to ratings of a 'culturally insensitive' counselor by a general population of White university students (Atkinson et al., 1992). The 'culturally sensitive' counselor's ratings were lower and closer to that of the culturally insensitive counselor when the rater viewed the 'insensitive counselor' first.

Fourth, multicultural counseling training was found to have no effect on the evaluation of the 'culturally insensitive' counselor. This might be attributed to the additive nature of multicultural counseling training. Raters at this level of graduate education, regardless of the level of multicultural counseling training, should be aware of inappropriate and/or ineffective use of microcounseling skills. Raters without multicultural training might know what is wrong or incompetent, but with multicultural counseling training, raters may be better able to identify what

is right and who is most competent in working with racial/ethnic minority clients. This would also explain the limited variance within the ratings of the 'culturally insensitive' counselor.

Implications for Evaluation in Supervision

To the extent that these results from a study of graduate level trainees are valid and generalizable to the evaluation process involved in supervision, findings support the necessity of multicultural counseling training in counselor education programs as a means of effective preparation for not only the role of counselor, but supervisor. Evaluation of cross-cultural counseling competence by White supervisors might also include the counselor evaluation by the client to circumvent any limitations in multicultural or supervision training that might have been experienced by the supervisor. White supervisors must be aware of a possible tendency to rate lower those trainees who do address race as a critical issue with minority clients, and subsequently choose to mediate this tendency by requesting client feedback and/or the feedback of colleagues who have more extensive multicultural counseling training. Otherwise, both 'culturally insensitive' and 'culturally sensitive' White trainees might tend to positively reinforce the avoidance of racial issues by White supervisors with limited multicultural training.

Given that most supervisor-supervisee dyads are White, that supervision is one of the more frequent activities of counseling psychologists (Fitzgerald & Osipow, 1986; Watkins, Lopez, Campbell, & Himmell, 1986), that some professionals who are currently in the role of supervisor have received limited, if any, multicultural counseling training (Lloyd, 1987), and that many have not received training in supervision (Hess & Hess, 1983; McColley & Baker, 1982), it would appear critical to consider the study of such dyads as a topic for future research. Studies

addressing the phenomenon of evaluation within the context of supervision of trainees counseling minority clients is strongly recommended.

References

Atkinson, D.R., Casas, A., & Abreu, J. (1992). Mexican-American acculturation, counselor ethnicity and cultural sensitivity, and perceived counselor competence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39(4), 515-520.

Atkinson, D.R., & Wampold, B. (1982). A comparison of the Counselor Rating Form and the counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale. Counselor Education and Supervision, 22, 25-35.

Barak, A., & LaCrosse, M.B. (1975).Multidimensional perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 471-476.

Barrett-Lennard, G.T. (1962). Dimensions of therapists' response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 76, (Whole, No. 43).

Bernard, J.M. (1994). Multicultural supervision: A reaction to Leong and Wagner, Cook, Priest, and Fukuyama. Counselor Education and Supervision, 34(2), 159-171.

Bernard, J.M., & Goodyear, R.K. (1992). Fundamentals of clinical supervision. Needham heights, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Blocher, D.G. (1983). Toward a cognitive developmental approach to counseling supervision. The Counseling Psychologist, 11(1), 27-34.

Carkhuff, R.R. (1969). Helping and human relations: A primer for lay and professional helpers (Vols. 1-2). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Carter, R.T. (1995). The influence of race and racial identity in psychotherapy toward a racially inclusive model. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Cook, D.A. (1994). Racial identity and supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 34(2), 132-141.

Corrigan, J.D., & Schmidt, L.D. (1983). Development and validation of revisions in the Counselor Rating Form. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 64-75.

D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1991). Evaluating the impact of multicultural counseling training. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 143-150.

Fitzgerald, L.F., & Osipow, S.H. (1986). An occupational analysis of counseling psychology: How special is the specialty? American Psychologist, 41, 535-544.

Gazda, G.M., Asbury, F.R., Balzea, F.J., Childers, W.C., & Walters, R.D. (1977). Human relations development (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gim, R.H., Atkinson, D.R., & Kim, S.J. (1991). Asian-American acculturation, counselor ethnicity and cultural sensitivity, and ratings of counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38(1), 57-62.

Hernandez, A.G., & LaFromboise, T.D. (1985, August). The development of the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory. Paper presented at the 93rd annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.

Hess, A.K., & Hess, K.A. (1983). Psychotherapy supervision: A survey of internship training practices. Professional Psychology, 14, 504-513.

Hunt, P. (1987). Black clients: Implications for supervision of trainees. Psychotherapy, 24(1), 114-119.

LaFromboise, T.D., Coleman, H.L.K., & Hernandez, A. (1991). Development and factor structure of the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory--Revised. Professional Psychology: Research and practice, 22, 380-388.

Leong, F.T.L., & Wagner, N.S. (1994). Cross-cultural counseling supervision: What do we know? What do we need to know? Counselor Education and Supervision, 34(2), 117-131.

Lloyd, A.P. (1987). Multicultural counseling: Does it belong in a counselor education program? Counselor Education and Supervision, 26, 164-167.

McColley, S.H., & Baker, E.L. (1982). Training activities and styles of beginning supervisors: A survey. Professional Psychology, 13, 282-292.

Ochs, N. (1994). The incidence of racial issues in White counseling dyads: An exploratory survey. Counselor Education and Supervision, 33(4), 305-313.

Ottavi, T.M., Pope-Davis, D.B., & Dings, J.G. (1994). Relationship between White racial identity attitudes and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41, 149-154.

Peterson, F.K. (1991). Issues of race and ethnicity in supervision: Emphasizing who you are, not what you know. Clinical Supervisor, 9(1), 15-31.

Pomales, J., Claiborne, C.D., & LaFromboise, T.D. (1986). Effects of Black students' racial identity on perceptions of White counselors varying in cultural sensitivity. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 57-61.

Sue, D.W., Bernier, J.E., Durran, A., Feinberg, L., Pedersen, P., Smith, E.J., & Vasquez-Nuttal, E. (1982). Position paper: Cross-cultural counseling competencies. The Counseling Psychologist, 10, 45-52.

Tyler, F.B., Brome, D.R., & Williams, J.E. (Eds.). (1991). Ethnic validity, ecology and psychotherapy: A psychosocial competence model. New York: Plenum Press.

Watkins, C.E., Lopez, F.G., Campbell, V.L., & Himmell, C.D. (1986). Contemporary counseling psychology: Results of a national survey. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 301-309.

Table 1.

Means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum scores, Pearson product correlations (n=54).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. CCCI-R	1.00	.72	-.54	.43	.44	.29	.28
(difference)		p=.00	p=.00	p=.001	p=.001	p=.02	p=.03
Mean = 21.15							
s.d. = 30.45							
Min. = -38							
Max. = 81							
2. CCCI-R		1.00	-.71	.37	.35	.27	.24
(cultural sensitive)			p=.000	p=.005	p=..009	p=..04	p=.07
Mean = 74.0							
s.d. = 27.59							
Min. = 10							
Max. = 116							
3. CCCI-R			1.00	-.13	-.19	-.06	-.09
(cultural insensitive)				p=.30	p=.14	p=64	p=.47
Mean = 52.82							
s.d. = 20.26							
Min. = 21							
Max. = 106							

Table 1.(continued)

Means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum scores, Pearson product correlations (n=54).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. MAKSS				1.00	.56	.82	.77
(total)					p=.000	p=.000	p=.000
Mean = 156.86							
s.d. = 16.23							
Min. = 118							
Max. = 187							
5. MAKSS					1.00	.24	.28
(awareness)						p=.06	p=.03
Mean = 54.82							
s.d. = 4.76							
Min. = 44							
Max. = 64							
6. MAKSS						1.00	.38
(knowledge)							p=.003
Mean = 51.37							
s.d. = 9.20							
Min. = 19							
Max. = 68							

Table 1.(continued)

Means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum scores, Pearson product correlations (n=54).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. MAKSS							1.00
(skills)							
Mean = 50.66							
s.d. = 7.71							
Min. = 30							
Max. = 65							

Table 2.

Results of the first multiple regression analysis that examined the contribution of the MAKSS subscale scores (Awareness, Knowledge, Skills) to the difference between CCCI-R #1(culturally sensitive counselor) and CCCI-R #2 (culturally insensitive counselor) ratings.

Variables	R square	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p
Awareness	.24891	3	12464.49843	4154.832	5.63	.002
Knowledge		51	37612.33794	737.496		
Awareness						

----------Variables in the Equation----------

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
Awareness	2.401223	.814941	.376928	2.947	.0048
Knowledge	.515489	.456423	.157010	1.181	.2430
Skills	.465268	.526560	.118730	.884	.3811
(Constant)	-160.354573	44.839549		-3.576	.0008

Table 3.

Results of the second multiple regression analysis that examined the contribution of the MAKSS subscale scores (Awareness, Knowledge, Skills) to CCCI-R ratings of the culturally sensitive counselor.

Variables	R square	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p
Awareness	.23706	4	9236.28339	2309.07085	3.728	.01
Knowledge		50	29725.18831	619.27476		
Skills						

----------Variables in the Equation----------

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
Awareness	1.462332	.77989	.268232	2.016	.0494
Knowledge	.455404	.406074	.154855	1.121	.2677
Skills	.623431	.495381	.179453	1.258	.2143
(Constant)	-104.715517	47.113624		-2.223	.0310

Table 4.

Results of the third multiple regression analysis that examined the contribution of the MAKSS subscale scores (Awareness, Knowledge, Skills) to CCCI-R ratings of the culturally insensitive counselor.

Variables	R square	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p
Awareness	.07881	4	1757.77130	439.44283	1.048	.39
Knowledge		50	20546.37684	419.31381		
Skills						

----------Variables in the Equation----------

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
Awareness	-.857181	.623511	-.198242	-1.375	.1755
Knowledge	.044958	.338865	.020255	.133	.8950
Skills	-.129184	.398220	-.049014	-.324	.7470
(Constant)	89.326112	37.801331		2.363	.0221